



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,191	12/03/2003	Joel A. Kubby	D/A1750D	5161

7590 10/27/2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

CULBERT, ROBERTS P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1763

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/727,191

Applicant(s)

KUBBY ET AL.

Examiner

Roberts Culbert

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/20/05 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1763

Claims 1, 2 and 4-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent application Publication 2003/0029705 A1 to Qiu et al. in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (TDB) NN 82024500, and U.S. Patent 6,888,979 to Behin et al.

Regarding Claim 1, Qiu et al. teaches a method for fabricating a bistable microelectromechanical system (MEMS) based system, comprising: lithographically defining at least one beam having a specified non-linear shape corresponding to a first stable state of the at least one beam. (Paragraphs 59, 62, 203 and 207)

Qiu et al. teaches that the bistable beam structure is well suited as a micro clip for switching optical fibers (Paragraph 200), but does not explicitly teach providing the optical fibers between a position of the first and second stable states. However, the claimed arrangement is old in the art of forming bistable optical switches. The IBM TDB reference teaches that it is known to provide optical fibers between a positions of the first and second stable states of a bistable switch. (See provided disclosure and Figures 1-4) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide optical fibers to the bistable actuator of Qiu et al. in order to fabricate an optical switch in the art recognized manner.

Qiu et al. further teaches providing various stops (See Figures 5, 8, and 12-21) to contact the at least one beam before the beam reaches a position of the second stable state wherein the beam is biased against the stops, however, Qiu et al does not expressly teach stops having a ridge to reduce stiction. Behin et al. teach that it is advantageous to form a ridge (landing pad) on stops for an optical MEMS switch to reduce stiction (Col. 7, Line 65 – Col. 8, Line 1) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a ridge on the stops of Qiu et al. in view of the IBM TDB reference, in order to reduce stiction as taught by Behin et al.

Regarding Claims 2 and 5-13, Qiu et al. illustrates that a beam is defined by the lithography process. The beam has a certain geometry (Paragraphs 59, 62) inherently including a certain curvature, height, length and width. The geometry of the beam inherently determines the second stable state, the throw distance, and the force curve as claimed by applicant.

Art Unit: 1763

Regarding Claims 17-19, Qiu et al. illustrates boundary conditions for the beam may include fixed, bearing and spring boundary conditions. (See for example, Paragraphs 76, 132 and 133)

Regarding Claims 14-16, Qiu et al. teaches that various actuators are suitable for use with the beam, including a thermal impact actuator (Paragraph 178) and a zippering electrostatic actuator (Paragraph 155).

Regarding Claim 4, Qiu et al. illustrates various stops for contacting the beam between the first and second stable states. (See Figures 12d-12f, for example) Note that although it is not explicitly stated, the beam must reach the contact point just before reaching the second stable state in order to contact the stop as illustrated by Qiu et al.

Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent application Publication 2003/0029705 A1 to Qiu et al. in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (TDB) NN 82024500 and U.S. Patent 6,888,979 to Behin et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,303,885 to Hichwa et al.

Regarding Claims 15 and 16, as applied above to claims 1,2 and 4-19, Qiu et al. in view of the cited IBM TDB and U.S. Patent 6,888,979 to Behin et al. teach the method of the invention substantially as claimed, but do not explicitly teach the use of a zippering electrostatic actuator or a thermal impact actuator. Qiu et al. teaches that various actuators are suitable for use with an actuated bistable beam, including a thermal impact actuator (Paragraph 178) and a zippering electrostatic actuator (Paragraph 155).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the well-known thermal and electrostatic actuators as suggested by Qiu et al. to actuate the bistable beam of Hichwa et al. since Hichwa teaches that electrostatic and thermal actuators are suitable means for driving the bistable beam (Col. 2, Lines 37-40)

Art Unit: 1763

Regarding Claims 20-22, as applied above to claims 1,2 and 4-19, Qiu et al teaches the method of the invention substantially as claimed, but does not teach patterning the at least one beam in a device layer of a silicon-on-insulator wafer, defining a height of the at least one beam using a thickness of the device layer, and partially etching an insulator layer between the device layer and a substrate to release the at least one beam with part of the insulator layer remaining to anchor the at least one beam to the substrate.

However, Qiu et al. suggests that various manufacturing methods may be employed especially conventional micro-fabrication techniques in silicon (Paragraph 202)

Hichwa et al. teaches a conventional microfabrication technique used in the patterning of bistable MEMS structures comprising patterning the at least one beam in a device layer of a silicon-on-insulator wafer, defining a height of the at least one beam using a thickness of the device layer, and partially etching an insulator layer between the device layer and a substrate to release the at least one beam with part of the insulator layer remaining to anchor the at least one beam to the substrate.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use one of the well-known MEMS fabrication techniques such as shown in Hichwa et al. to form the bistable MEMS structure of Qiu et al. in order to form the bistable MEMS structure using one of several known conventional processing methods.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent application Publication 2003/0029705 A1 to Qiu et al. in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (TDB) NN 82024500, and U.S. Patent 6,888,979 to Behin et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,367,251 to Wood.

As applied above to claims 1,2 and 4-19, Qiu et al. in view of the cited IBM TDB and U.S. Patent 6,888,979 to Behin et al. teach the method of the invention substantially as claimed, but do not teach that the height of the beam is greater than the width. The relationship between height and width cannot be determined since the illustrations of the beams are not in three dimensions.

Art Unit: 1763

Wood illustrates bi-stable beams having a height greater than the width. (Figures 1A and 1B) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to form the beams of Qiu et al. having the relative dimensions as shown in Wood in order to provide a bi-stable beam having the conventional physical and mechanical characteristics as shown in Wood.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberts Culbert whose telephone number is (571) 272-1433. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on (571) 272-1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

R. Culbert
Examiner
Art Unit 1763




Parviz Hassanzadeh
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1763